



IFW

Applicant : Perry PHILP et al
Appl. No : 10/654,956
Filed : September 5, 2003
Title : REINFORCING NET

Grp./A.U. : 1771
Examiner : Matthew D. MATZEK

Docket No. : 213-043/HRH
Customer No.: 0010159

December 12, 2006

The Commissioner of Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
U.S.A.

RESPONSE – INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Sir:

This is in response to the examiner's communication mailed November 27, 2006.

The examiner's letter set out an interview summary involving the examiner, the examiner's supervisor and the undersigned, agent for the applicant.

Applicant has already responded to the outstanding office action, the response having been filed December 1, 2006.

In that Response After Final, applicant has fully addressed all of the issues set out in the interview, and thus, applicant believes that it has already included the substance of the interview as required.

Appln. No. 10/654,956
Response dated December 12, 2006
Reply to office action of November 27, 2006

Notwithstanding the foregoing, applicant has now reviewed the interview summary as prepared by the examiner. It is believed that the comments set out by the examiner clearly reflect the summary set out in applicant's response and applicant therefore agrees with the matters addressed.

In the final sentence of the interview summary material, the examiner has raised the issue that while the Sasaki reference does not anticipate a helically wound conduit as discussed and agreed, the examiner has now pointed out that in the examiner's view, the Sasaki reference would be applied to the ribbon and laminate claims if they were to remain in their present form. In the response which has been filed, applicant has not amended the claims directed to the ribbon and laminate. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the examiner's application of Sasaki in this regard. If Sasaki were to be relied upon by the examiner in respect of the ribbon or laminate claims, it is pointed out that Sasaki does not have any spreader yarns at all let alone the two separated substantially parallel continuously extending spreader yarns as set out in claim 13. Thus, Sasaki does not anticipate claim 13 or any claims dependent thereon and does not render those claims obvious all for the reasons more thoroughly set out in the response previously filed dealing with any combination of Sasaki in the context of claim 46. It is respectfully submitted the same comments are equally applicable to claim 13 and those claims dependent thereon.

Appln. No. 10/654,956
Response dated December 12, 2006
Reply to office action of November 27, 2006

It remains applicant's position that with the entry of the amended declaration as filed with applicant's most recent response all of the claims are then in condition for allowance, at least in respect of the points raised by the examiner to date, and the applicant thus looks forward to either a notice of allowance, or if not, further comments and support from the examiner in due course.

Respectfully submitted,

Bereskin & Parr

By 

H. Roger Hart, Reg. No. 26,426
(416) 957-1691

HRH/jb